IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

JANE DOE, a student, by and through her)	
parents, John Doe, her father, and Mary)	
Doe, her mother, et al.,)	
)	NO. 3:23-cv-00422
Plaintiffs,)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
)	
V.)	
)	
CURREY INGRAM ACADEMY,)	
)	
Defendant		

ORDER

Pending before the Court is "Currey Ingram Academy's Rule 12 Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim and Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction" (Doc. No. 13, "Motion"), supported by an accompanying memorandum of law (Doc. No. 14, "Supporting Memorandum"). Via the Motion, Defendant asserts that: (i) the first two claims (federal claims under Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 *et seq.*) should be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim upon which relief should be granted, and (ii) that with the federal claims dismissed, jurisdiction over the final ten claims (the state-law claims) is lacking because they do not present a federal jurisdiction as required for jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and there is no diversity of citizenship between the parties that Plaintiffs have filed a response in opposition to the Motion (Doc. No. 21, "Response"), to which Defendant filed a reply (Doc. No. 22, "Reply").

For the reasons set forth in the accompanying memorandum opinion, the Motion (Doc. No. 13) is GRANTED. Plaintiffs' Title IX claims (Counts I and II) are hereby dismissed pursuant to

Rule 12(b)(6), and Plaintiffs' other claims (the state-law claims) are dismissed without prejudice due to the Court declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over them.¹ The Clerk is directed to enter judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58 and close the file.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Eli Richardson

¹ Notably, the rationale for the Court's dismissal of the state-law claims is actually somewhat (though not entirely) different from the rationale for such dismissal asserted by Defendant.